REMARKS

Claims 1, 9, 21, and 23 were rejected under §102 over McCurdy '956. This rejection is moot as the rejected claims are combined with dependent claims differently rejected.

Claims 4-7 and 24-27 were rejected under §103 over McCurdy, newly applied, in view of Foster '181. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Foster. Foster discloses separation particles of wood flour, polymer, and salts (col. 1, line 5) but says that inorganic materials are not suitable for high temps (col. 1, line 20). Foster teaches "inert, refractory" materials (col. 2, line 65) such a metal oxides (col. 3, line 26) for use at "elevated temperatures" (Abstract and col. 4, line 5).

Foster discloses only "submicron" particles (col. 1, lines 64 and 68; col. 2, lines 7, 15, 66, and 67; col. 3, lines 6, 15, 18, and 28; col. 4, line 10; col. 6, lines 34 and 54), and states that its particles are "preferably" below 0.1 micron in size (col. 2, line 8). Foster teaches strongly against larger particles, stating that submicron size is the "primary requirement" (col. 2, line 14), and that "particle size is of critical importance" (col. 2, line 62) because larger particles will cause the glass to sag, aquire an indented or dimpled surface, and undergo "marring" (col. 3, line 4; this is also taught at col. 4, lines 5-9). Both of Foster's independent claims recite the "submicron" particle feature.

McCurdy. McCurdy teaches particles made of polymer with a high molecular weight of "at least 200,000" (col. 2, line 44; col. 3, line 7), preferably "at least 1,000,000" (col. 3, line 8), and says "These properties [are] critical in an interleaving material" (col. 3, line 17). McCurdy says that ordinary polymers (col. 1, lines 39-43) do not prevent marring (col. 1, line 47) and that polymer under 200,000 molecular weight will cause marring (col. 2, lines 63-66).

McCurdy teaches 20-300 micron particles, preferably 100-300 (col. 3, line 33 and claims 6 and 7) or even larger if they won't settle (col. 3, line 36). McCurdy states, "The particle size

should be large enough to provide sufficient separation between the stacked glass sheets ... and prevent the development of a vacuum between adjacent sheets" (col. 3, line 44).

Combination. With respect, the two references strongly teach against each other. First, they teach against each others' materials; second, they teach against each others' particle sizes. The Examiner asserts motivation to "provide McCurdy [with Foster's] inorganic material ... so as to avoid sticking the glasses and scratching" (page 3) but McCurdy teaches that even soft materials like polyethylene (col. 1, line 41) are unsatisfactory; refractory materials, such as the silicon and aluminum oxides mentioned by Foster, would be still more unsuitable. Such oxides are usually classified as ceramics, and are used for grinding glass.

Specific Materials. The Examiner points to "various salts" at col. 1, line 17 and "inorganic materials" at col. 4, line 5 in Foster, and asserts that claims 5, etc., are anticipated (page 3, line 8). The Examiner is applying a general category (e.g., "salt") as anticipating a specific material (e.g., "calcium carbonate"), which is respectfully submitted to be incorrect. The Examiner's assertion is akin to asserting that "thing" anticipates any specific mechanism, rather than (correctly) the other way around. If the Examiner is taking official notice of the dependent claim features, this is traversed and a reference disclosing them is requested.

Claims 8, 28, and 30-35 were rejected under §103 over McCurdy in view of Hay '312, newly applied. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

These claims recite particles sized 150 mesh (~56 microns) to 300 mesh (~112 microns). The Examiner asserts that Hay's abstract anticipates this range. However, Hay actually describes "particles less than about 30 mesh and having only a minor portion less than about 200 mesh." At col. 4, line18, Hay states that 90 to 98 percent of the particles "pass a 30 mesh screen" and these are mixed with other particles that are 60 mesh (col. 4, line 31). In the claims, Hay recites 120 mesh and 60 mesh. With respect, Hay teaches a particle size smaller than that which is

claimed. The possible overlap in the cited reference is not seen to be a definite anticipation, as Hay appears to teach 200 mesh as an upper limit and only a "minor portion" even approaches that limit.

Respectfully submitted,

October 2, 2005
Date

Nick Bromer

Nick Bromer
Registration No. 33,478
RABIN & BERDO, PC
Customer No. 23995
Telephone: 202-371-8976
Facsimile: 202-408-0924

I certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (fax no. 571-273-8300) on October 2, 2006.

Nick Bromer [reg. no. 33,478] *Signature* Nick Bromer